IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION

IN RE: § CASE NO. 22-90341-11

§ JOINTLY ADMINISTERED

§ HOUSTON, TEXAS

CORE SCIENTIFIC, INC., § TUESDAY,

§ JANUARY 3, 2023

DEBTOR. § 11:00 A.M. TO 3:33 P.M.

MOTION HEARING (VIA ZOOM)

BEFORE THE HONORABLE DAVID R. JONES UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

APPEARANCES: SEE NEXT PAGE

(Recorded via CourtSpeak.)

TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE BY:

JUDICIAL TRANSCRIBERS OF TEXAS, LLC 935 Eldridge Road, #144
Sugar Land, TX 77478
281-277-5325
www.judicialtranscribers.com

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

APPEARANCES (VIA ZOOM):

INC.:

FOR DEBTOR CORE SCIENTIFIC, WEIL GOTSHAL & MANGES, LLP Alfredo R. Perez, Esq. 700 Louisiana Street Suite 1700 Houston, TX 77002 713-546-5040

> WEIL GOTSHAL & MANGES, LLP Ronit J. Berkovich, Esq. Theodore E. Tsekerides, Esq. 767 Fifth Avenue New York, New York 10153 212-310-8534

FOR CELSIUS MINING, LLC, ET AL.:

KIRKLAND & ELLIS, LLP Christopher Koenig, Esq. 300 N. Lasalle Street Chicago, IL 60654 312-862-2372

(Please also see Electronic Appearances.)

HOUSTON, TEXAS; TUESDAY, JANUARY 3, 2023; 11:00 A.M.

THE COURT: All right. Officially good morning to everyone. Happy New Year. Today is January the 3rd, 2023, the time is 11:00 o'clock Central. On the 11:00 o'clock docket we have the jointly administered cases under Case Number 22-90341, Core Scientific, Inc.

Folks, please don't forget to record your electronic appearance. If it's the first or if it's been a while, perhaps even an entire year, that's a quick trip to the website, a couple of mouse clicks, you can do that at any time prior to the conclusion of this morning's hearing.

The first time that you speak if you will please state your name and who you represent, that really does help give the court reporter a good point of reference in the event that a transcript request is made.

We are recording this morning using CourtSpeak, I will have the audio up on the docket shortly after the conclusion of this morning's hearing.

I previously told everyone -- there we go -- that I have activated the hand raising feature. If you know you're going to be speaking and haven't already done so, if you'd give me a 5 star.

And, Mr. Perez, I just saw you. I don't think, just looking at the numbers, that we have the Weil office in New York unmuted.

1 MR. KOENIG: Your Honor, good morning. This is 2 Chris Koeniq. We just want to confirm that our audio is 3 working. 4 THE COURT: I saw you pop on earlier and I did -- I 5 did hear you, so, yes. 6 MR. KOENIG: Thank you. 7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Your Honor, we can't hear you 8 at all --9 THE COURT: You can't hear me? 10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- if you were planning to 11 speak to us. 12 THE COURT: Wow. Should I start over? 13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, Your Honor. 14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can hear you now, Your 15 Thank you. Honor. 16 THE COURT: My apologies. My apologies to everyone. 17 So let me start again. The time is 11:01 Central. Happy New 18 Year to everyone. Today is January the 3rd, 2023, this is the 19 docket for Houston, Texas. On the docket this morning we have 20 the jointly administered cases under Case Number 22-90341, 21 Core Scientific, Inc. 22 We are recording this morning using CourtSpeak, 23 we'll have the audio up on the docket shortly after the 24 conclusion of the hearing. Please don't forget to record your

electronic appearance. That's a quick trip to the website,

25

you can do that at any time prior to the conclusion of the hearing.

The first time that you do speak, if you would, please state your name and who you represent. That does -- it plays a very important role in help giving the court reporters a point of reference in the event that a transcript request is made. I think I got -- I was better the first time than I was the second.

In any event, Mr. Perez, good morning. Are you doing intros and then handing it off?

MR. PEREZ: I think, Your Honor, that's correct, along with me is my partners, Ronit Berkovich and Ted

Tsekerides, and I think Ms. Berkovich will handle the matters initially.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Let me ask -- let me first -- are we going forward today?

MS. BERKOVICH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Is there -- I really didn't understand the reason why there was a request to seal Celsius' preliminary objection. Was that done by agreement, was there a discussion. I generally don't like to do that unless there is a reason, and having read it, I just didn't see the reason.

MR. KOENIG: Your Honor, for the Record, Chris Koenig, Kirkland & Ellis, for Celsius and its affiliated

debtors and debtors-in-possession. Those are objections. Your Honor, there's a protective order in the Celsius case. That material is governed by the protective order. In advance of filing our objection we reached out to counsel for Core and asked them, you know, what, if anything, they believed was confidential and should be sealed. They provided us with a list.

To be clear, and as Your Honor may have seen in our sealing motion, we don't believe that the sealing of that information is necessary, but pursuant to the protective order that's what we're required to do, it was designated by Core, so we abide with our obligations under our protective order filed and under seal, and under that protective order Core has 7 days to object and argue about why that should be sealed. And if they don't object, it will automatically be unsealed after 7 days. So there's a process to go through.

Again, just to be clear, we don't believe that it needs to be sealed, or should be sealed, but we did it at the request of Court.

THE COURT: All right. So this was -- yes,
Mr. Tsekerides. Good morning.

MR. TSEKERIDES: Yes, Your Honor. I want to address the point. Ted Tsekerides from Weil for the Debtors on the sealing issue.

So most of those documents related to third-party

agreements or third-party discussions and that's why we kept them confidential because they're not just our information. And, you know, the transcripts from the depositions, we allowed those in and anything that was between the parties we allowed those in. But because the documents that they wanted related to third parties, that's why we maintain the confidentiality. Separate from the issue that we don't think any of that is relevant, but just on the confidentiality point, that was the reason behind it.

THE COURT: So was that with respect to Mr. Brown's affidavit?

MR. TSEKERIDES: Yes, it was all on the issue about the underlying dispute on the contracts.

THE COURT: No, so let me --

MR. TSEKERIDES: So the documents are --

THE COURT: -- so let me take a step back, and again, I'm not trying to get in the middle of whatever arrangement was made. Mr. Brown's affidavit is totally inappropriate for so many different reasons. I'm not going to consider it on any basis. Quite frankly it probably ought to simply be struck based upon what's on file.

But I want to talk just about the objection itself, which is Docket Number 211 which is the actual -- that's the actual sealed document. Is there a reason why that should be sealed? And if there is, I'm not -- again, I'm not trying to

step on the toes of any agreement that's been reached. Just having read it, I don't understand why it was sealed. I got why you would have an issue with Mr. Brown's affidavit, but best I can tell, that wasn't actually sealed.

MR. TSEKERIDES: Well, we didn't discuss with them in advance the objection. They had sent us a list of documents that related to the underlying dispute and some deposition testimony, and that's what we referred to. And there are -- when I read the objection this morning, I mean I think the front half, it relates to the dispute about the rejection to the extent that there is one, and then the back half is on the underlying contract dispute which we don't even think is relevant in the rejection context.

Presumably if they were assuming -- because there is reference to the underlying documents that are confidential in that back half, probably that's why they sealed that. But that -- I didn't see this beforehand, but the driver for the sealing from our perspective were these third-party documents that some are referenced in this objection.

THE COURT: Right. But the documents -- all of the materials themselves are attached to Mr. Brown's affidavit which, again, just looking at it, isn't sealed.

MR. TSEKERIDES: Right.

MR. PEREZ: Your Honor -- sorry, go ahead.

MR. TSEKERIDES: Your Honor, there was a sealed

version and an unsealed version. Certainly the exhibits are not confidential and were not sealed. Certain of the exhibits were confidential and were sealed for that reason. There's two versions. The sealed version is at 212 -- I'm sorry, yeah, the affidavit, 214 is the sealed version which has all of the documents, and 212 is the redacted version which those documents that were confidential was attached to the affidavit publicly and the remainder were not attached.

THE COURT: I did not -- I did not appreciate that that they weren't identical. Okay. I got it. All right.

And so -- but with respect to the objection itself, that was sealed as well. Correct?

MR. TSEKERIDES: That's right, Your Honor. We did that because we made referenced in the objection to certain documents that Core's counsel told us they believe was confidential and so we didn't want to have the horse sort of be out of the barn at that point if it turned out that those documents were to be confidential.

And again, we don't believe that they are, that the references are confidential, but, you know, it's hard to reseal something once we've posted public.

THE COURT: No --

MR. TSEKERIDES: And the only --

THE COURT: -- one second that it -- one second on the docket and it's not longer sealed. I totally got that.

But I do -- and again, if there's a legitimate reason that it should be sealed, then I'm all for it. But I really disfavor the situations where anyone who has an interest in the case can't understand what's going on because, you know, everything gets sealed.

And again, if there's a good reason to seal it, I'm all for it. I don't want it to be used as a competitive advantage or embarrassment or if it discloses any sort of confidential information. I just didn't see it.

Mr. Tsekerides?

MR. TSEKERIDES: Yes, I think the point I made there, Your Honor, in looking at their objection is to Page 9 before Section 4. As it relates to the rejection, I don't think any of that -- that section has anything to do with the underlying dispute and the documents at issue. They could have -- we didn't say anything about that, they could have unsealed that front portion or redacted the back.

You know, having gone through every document that they cite from Section 4 to the end, I'm sure there's some in here that fall within what we would consider competitive information and third-party information, but certainly in addition to not being relevant. But I think they could easily unseal the first 8-3/4 pages that have nothing to do with the underlying dispute or a claim of confidentiality and relate just to the rejection piece.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right. So for purposes of today, because I don't want to get off track, I'm going to leave it where it sits. But I'm urging everybody, again, if there's a legitimate reason to seal something, then fine. And I understand that there are real reasons to do it, but I really don't want to see as a developing habit where every single pleading is sealed, because I think that just a disservice to the process and I just don't think it's needed most of the time. (Pause in the proceedings.) THE COURT: Ah, wonder what happened? (Pause in the proceedings.) MR. PEREZ: Your Honor --THE COURT: All right. Evidently the entire call was dropped. My apologies. We'll go back as far as we need to. I do have everybody muted, so if you would give me a 5 star again, it would be much appreciated. MR. PEREZ: Your Honor, we can hear you now. This is Alfredo Perez. THE COURT: Thank you. And I have you unmuted. waiting for the other folks. Yes, Mr. Koenig, and --(Pause in the proceedings.) THE COURT: Mr. Tsekerides, can you hear me? MR. TSEKERIDES: (No audible response.)

```
1
                   THE COURT: Mr. Perez, could you text your
2
         colleagues in New York and --
3
                   MR. PEREZ: Yes.
4
                   THE COURT: -- tell them that they need to dial in
5
         again?
6
                   MR. PEREZ: Yes, sir.
7
              (Pause in the proceedings.)
8
                   THE COURT: Mr. Koenig, can you hear me? Just
9
         thumbs up or thumbs down.
10
                   All right. I need for you hit 5 star again.
11
              (Pause in the proceedings.)
12
                   MR. KOENIG: Your Honor, it looks like our whole
13
         line dropped, so we re-dialed -- we re-dialed in on my cell
14
         phone. We're coming in -- can you hear me okay on the cell
15
         phone?
16
                   THE COURT: Loud and clear however you're doing it.
17
                   MR. KOENIG: Okay. So I missed whatever until just
18
         now when you asked me if we could hear you.
19
                   THE COURT: So let me -- let's just take a minute
20
         and get everybody in. I've got Mr. Perez back and he's live.
21
         I don't think that we have Mr. Tsekerides back on the line
22
         yet.
23
                   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Your Honor, we'll put in the
24
         chat that everybody should redial and that's the best way to
25
         get reconnected.
```

1	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, they're connected.
2	THE COURT: I think everyone has everyone has
3	done that, I now have 80-some-odd folks back on the line. But
4	thank you.
5	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Your Honor, and I
6	think (indiscernible).
7	(Pause in the proceedings.)
8	THE COURT: I can read your lips, but I can't hear
9	you. Hold on, there's a Chicago number just popped up.
10	MR. KOENIG: There we go. Thank you, Your Honor.
11	Appreciate you appreciate you helping us through the
12	technicalities.
13	THE COURT: No, no, no. Let's see, do we have
14	no, we don't even have ah, there, he's back.
15	Mr. Tsekerides, can you hear me?
16	MR. TSEKERIDES: (No audible response.)
17	THE COURT: I can't hear you. Could you give me
18	MR. TSEKERIDES: Yes.
19	THE COURT: there it is, there's the 646 number.
20	All right.
21	MR. TSEKERIDES: Okay. Are we good?
22	THE COURT: We are good. All right. So I don't
23	know where I lost you, but let me just sort of take a step
24	back.
25	And again, I want to make it very clear, if there

are legitimate reasons for pleadings to be sealed, all for it. I understand the reasons for that. What I don't want to do is to start a habit where every single thing that gets filed in the case is sealed. I just think that that does a disservice to the process.

And again, if there are reasons that part or all of this, the motion, the affidavit -- I'm sorry, the objection to the affidavit should be sealed, I don't want to parse through and say, Pages 2 through 8 shouldn't be and the remainder should be. I'll leave it like it is and just please, you know, look at -- take the position of being yourself on the outside looking in, wanting to follow and wanting to understand what's going on in the case.

Legitimate reason, great. But otherwise I'd really prefer the transparency. So let's just proceed from there. Okay?

MR. TSEKERIDES: We can certainly do that, Your Honor. Thank you.

MR. PEREZ: And, Your Honor, this is Alfredo Perez, but we did file a redacted version of the objection at 213, I think. So that's the one that I pulled out before we ever got anything else.

THE COURT: No, I just -- where I started was the sealed version of the objection, and I just didn't understand why it was sealed. I didn't learn anything in there that I

didn't have already in my base knowledge set, and if I just didn't understand it because all I see is what's on the docket.

All right. So with that let me --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All right. Thank you.

THE COURT: No, thank you both. So let me go ahead and -- Mr. Koenig, again, I'm not trying to dictate how this proceeding goes.

I'm still trying to understand what it is that your primary complaint focuses on. Because I'm having difficulty, other than trying to be strategic, I'm having great difficulty in understanding the position that you're taking.

MR. KOENIG: Sure. Sure, Your Honor. Again, for the Record, Chris Koenig.

So, look, our concern here, Your Honor, is process and timing. Let me start with the strategic point. We're not seeking to make a dollar off for following today. We've agreed that they can turn off our rates effective today and that, you know, they don't get to continue to charge us, we don't continue to pay for it. We understand.

What we're trying to do is make sure that there's a process that gives us adequate time to talk to our stakeholders, gives us the opportunity to talk to Judge Glenn and move forward on that basis. And candidly, Your Honor, we think this is an emergency entirely of Core's own making.

They filed this two business days ago. They knew all of the facts and the petition date, it was in the First Day Declarations, referenced at the First Day Hearing.

We don't really understand why they filed it when they did last week, but since he said there is an emergency that's valid, we've agreed to take care of that by turning — if we allow them to turn off the rates, their alleged harm from continuing to go through and have to pay — or continue a service of contract that they believe is not value maximizing, that that concern will no longer be there.

But that'll give us the adequate time that we need, and we think is appropriate, to, you know, we're a Debtor in our own Chapter 11 case, we have our own bankruptcy judge, and we have litigation with Core that is pending before Judge Glenn right now.

So we're trying to be mindful of Judge Glenn, we don't want to get sideways with him, we don't want him to feel like the rug was sort of pulled out from under him on an emergency basis. And if this had been set on regular notice, we would have had time to work with Core and to go to the -- to go to Judge Glenn and propose a lift stay motion.

To be clear, we're not opposing the rejection at the appropriate time, we're not opposing the lifting of the automatic stay because we think the Court could demonstrate cause. But we think as a technical matter the automatic stay

exists and is in place and the Debtor can't just waive the automatic stay. There's black letter law that says that the estate -- not only the Debtor, but the Debtor's creditors to make sure that the Debtor can't lift the stay to allow a friendly creditor proceed. And so we think that the process is important.

And again, we don't think that Core is going to suffer one iota from having done this because they can turn off the power on our rig today. But that'll give us time to go to our own constituents, to go to our court, and, you know, we will support a joint stipulation with Core that we believe the automatic stay should be lifted, and that'll also give us the time to continue to work with Core on the terms of the transition.

I'm sure Your Honor saw in the objection we filed last night that we proposed terms for the -- from the transition of the 37,000 rigs. We just, frankly given the emergency, haven't had the time to finish working that out with Core's counsel. But we think that that would be appropriate and reasonable, and frankly we think it's required by the automatic stay in our own case.

THE COURT: And so what provision of the automatic stay is it that you think that the shear act of rejection violates?

MR. KOENIG: We think it's control over property of

the estate. I mean it's black letter law that the Debtor can enforce compliance with an executory contract by the non-debtor counterparty. Well, we're two Debtors here.

But Celsius can tell Core to comply with the contract, and it's an automatic stay provision, and that's what we did, that's exactly what we did in our bankruptcy. We brought a motion for contempt and a motion to enforce the automatic stay to compel the non-debtor counterparty, the then non-debtor counterparty Core, to comply with the automatic stay. And so we believe --

THE COURT: So let's peel that back a bit. So the act of rejection is simply nothing more than giving the Debtor the right to breach the agreement and excusing --

MR. KOENIG: (Indiscernible), breach, yeah.

THE COURT: -- and excusing future performance. A motion to enforce and for contempt absolutely impacts the stay in this case. Do you agree?

MR. KOENIG: We agree and that's why we haven't pursued that motion in our own case yet.

THE COURT: And so how is it -- because the Debtor could -- the Debtor could just stop performing and that wouldn't violate the stay.

MR. KOENIG: That's before, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes. They could just stop performing and it doesn't violate the stay.

1 MR. KOENIG: I think it could violate Celsius's 2 stay. 3 THE COURT: How so? 4 MR. KOENIG: I think in order for us to continue --5 THE COURT: If I just decided not to perform -- I'm 6 a third party dealing with your Celsius Debtor. If I choose 7 not to perform, how could that possibly violate the automatic stay in your case, and what provision? 8 9 MR. KOENIG: Because we have the right, Your Honor, 10 to -- like the contract is itself property of the estate, and 11 contractual rights are property of the estate, and so we have 12 the ability to enforce those contractual rights in our own 13 bankruptcy and we filed a motion to enforce the automatic stay 14 in our bankruptcy --15 THE COURT: But that's not the stay --16 MR. KOENIG: -- on that --17 THE COURT: -- the stay doesn't have to do a 18 seeking enforcement. You can absolutely file a motion to 19 compel performance. But until you do that, until you have an 20 order, which you don't have an order and you can't get one at 21 this point without violating the stay in my case --22 MR. KOENIG: Agreed. 23 THE COURT: -- how does non-performance violate the 24 automatic stay? 25 MR. KOENIG: Because we have contractual -- we have

contractual rights that's property of the estate and their failure to perform under them is --

THE COURT: It gives rise to a claim perhaps, but tell me what provision of the automatic stay that simple non-performance violates.

MR. KOENIG: I think it's an attempt to exercise control over the property --

THE COURT: Not even close.

MR. KOENIG: -- of the estate because our property of the estate includes the --

THE COURT: What am I trying to exercise control over? I'm just simply saying I either can't or won't perform. What property right is that exercising control over, other than my own?

MR. KOENIG: Our contractual -- it's our contractual right to compel performance from a non-debtor.

THE COURT: So if I told you that I consider that to be a frivolous argument, where would you like to go from here?

MR. KOENIG: Your Honor, what I would say is we have litigation that's pending in front of Judge Glenn and we think that it's appropriate that, as I said earlier, that he not sort of have the rug pulled out from under him, but there's litigation that this would effectively moot. If the rejection goes forward, that would moot the litigation in front of Judge Glenn.

THE COURT: How so? It may limit it, but how does it pull the rug out from underneath him? If there was a right between your petition date and the date of rejection, that cause of action hasn't been affected. It hasn't -- just simply rejecting the contract doesn't affect what happens next, it doesn't affect what happens to the computers, it doesn't happen to enforcement.

MR. KOENIG: Sure. Your Honor, I'll concede that.

I'll move instead to the rate for the property of the estate
that we're really concerned about. Right? It's not about -at this point --

THE COURT: And I totally agree.

MR. KOENIG: -- it's not about the contractual rights.

THE COURT: So let --

MR. KOENIG: It's about the rent, it's about the --sorry, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me say this to both of you, for one, the Debtor has almost an unqualified right to reject so long as there is a rational business reason for doing it. And you've acknowledged that that reason exists.

So what -- and, again, I'm talking to you, but I'm also talking to the Debtor, I'm not going to let you use this as a strategic maneuver, and I think that you're actually taking advantage of Judge Glenn without Judge Glenn being able

to voice his own concerns. I think it's exactly the opposite of what you're representing to me.

That all being said, my Debtor is not going to use the rejection of the contract to gain a strategic advantage in dealing with very valuable and expensive and sensitive property which are the computers themselves. So what I -- and again, I'm not trying to dictate the course of the hearing, I just need to get this on the right track, because you folks have had -- you folks are not talking to one another, you're talking past one another. And I don't think that you want a third part in this conversation because I tend not to listen very well.

There needs to be a structured, agreed, orderly, efficient, cost-effective way of dealing with the termination of the relationship without prejudice to whatever monetary issues may exist out there. You folks will work that out. But I'm not going to let this -- there aren't going to be computers on the sidewalk and I know that nobody would do that, but it's just a statement. There aren't going to be computers on the sidewalk, there isn't going to be -- there isn't going to be air conditioning turned off that would endanger sensitive electronic components. It isn't going to be where you've got to come pick them up between the hours of 4:00 and 5:00. Not going to happen. We're going to do this the right way.

So we can have a hearing on whether or not the Debtor's entitled to reject the agreement. You in the response -- or you in the objection acknowledge that that's a losing battle, it's just a question of when. And I'm telling you the when is going to be right now, and we can spend time figuring out the right way to effectuate the transition so that we maximize the current situation that we find ourselves in for both bankruptcy estates. That's what we should all be working toward.

I'm not trying to hang somebody up with a contempt motion or a sanctions motion or trying to set this up so that we can charge rent for computers or we can try to make a point. Not going to happen either way.

But it just seems to me that we ought to be focused on having a conversation about how we end this in an honorable and transparent way without the involvement of either Judge Glenn or Judge Jones. This ought to be an operational transition that quite frankly no one who wears the black dress ought to be engaged in.

Now unfortunately for you I lived in a data center for a long time and I feel like I know an awful lot about it, and we don't really want to test that theory.

So let me ask: Do we want to take a break and perhaps talk about a reset on how to proceed with the hearing, or do we want to proceed ahead with the hearing?

MR. KOENIG: Your Honor, I think it would be helpful for us to have a few minutes to talk offline and come back to Your Honor. And we certainly understand and appreciate your comments about the stay. Just to be clear we just felt like we couldn't concede it in our case, and given that we have our own judge and our own constituents, it was something that we felt like we had to do.

THE COURT: I'm not bothered by it at all. I think it's wrong, I think there's a huge difference between rejecting a contract and then what happens next. It's the what happens next that absolutely touches on the stay.

And I haven't heard, and I asked everyone who would listen to me over the past couple of days as to give me the best argument you can come up with as to how a rejection would possibly violate an automatic stay in a case filed by the counterparty. I haven't heard it yet. It may be that it's out there and I just haven't met anybody smart enough and I may not be smart enough to come up with it myself. But I don't see it. It's what happens next.

And so, you know, I want -- the thing that happens next is the most important thing to me, so let's focus on that. Let me ask, the Weil team have any opposition, because it is your hearing, and again, I didn't mean to highjack your hearing, any objection from the Weil team about taking a couple of minutes and see if we can talk about what I think

the most important part of this is, and that's the transition?

MS. BERKOVICH: No objection, Your Honor. We agree with you.

THE COURT: So it's 11:30. This is not a short conversation. Should we check in at noon, does that make sense, and that would be noon Central, 30 minutes from now for everybody?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That makes sense though.

THE COURT: All right. Then what I'll do, I'm going to leave everything up and running. I will mute everything and I'll make sure that I don't -- I'll make sure that unmute it when I get back on. If it turns out that there are productive discussions and you need more time, just have somebody pop back on and say, we need more time, and that way folks who want to monitor can hear it, and we'll figure out what to do next.

If we don't go in a productive direction, then what I'll expect when we come back at noon is that the Debtor will present its case and we'll move forward. Okay?

MS. BERKOVICH: Yes, we've actually had preliminary discussions about these logistical issues that have been -- we're confident that we can use the 30 minutes productively to get (indiscernible). We'll start that right away.

THE COURT: Terrific. All right. Then I'll see everybody back at noon Central. Thank you.

1 MR. KOENIG: Thank you. 2 (Recess taken from 11:31 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.) 3 AFTER RECESS 4 THE COURT: All right. Folks, it is 12:00 o'clock 5 We are back on the Record in the jointly administered 6 cases under Case Number 22-90341, Core Scientific. 7 Folks, where are we? 8 MR. KOENIG: Your Honor, Chris Koenig for the 9 Record. We had very productive conversations, we used the 10 time well. Language was proposed by Core that we believe 11 works, we've recommended it to our client. Frankly we need 12 the client to sign off on it, we're not expecting any issues, 13 but, you know, we need a little bit more time to confirm with 14 the client. Our proposal would be to submit an agreed form of 15 order, you know, assuming that the client agrees to it. 16 think that we're resolved on the terms of an orderly 17 transition that works for both Celsius and with Core. 18 THE COURT: All right. The Debtor agree? 19 MS. BERKOVICH: Your Honor, yes, that's agreed. 20 Just one request, they're losing more than \$1,000 an hour by 21

leaving the machines on, so since it's agreed that we can turn the machines off, we intend to do so right after this hearing while we work out the form of order.

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Mr. Koenig, any objection to that? MR. KOENIG: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And I assume that there's no process for taking the machines down, it literally is just disconnecting power?

MS. BERKOVICH: No, there is a process to track how it ties -- oh, for right now, no, it's simply turning off the power.

THE COURT: Ah. Okay. I just -- I lived a life where there was a process to taking something down. I just want to make sure that we were following any protocol that was in place or any process that was needed in order to ensure the longevity or preserve the integrity of the equipment.

MS. BERKOVICH: Core will do that in the decommissioning process.

THE COURT: Right. Mr. Koenig, let me ask --

MR. KOENIG: (Indiscernible) --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Go ahead.

MR. KOENIG: I was going to say -- I apologize, Your Honor, I was just going to say that's part of the language that we've agreed to, it's part of the transition of how is Core going to be (indiscernible) and get everything ready for pick up. But as far as just turning off the machines, we have no objection to them doing that right after this hearing.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's just -- let's talk to the people that know and make sure that -- again, you know, I've lived in a world where if you flipped off the power switch

without running a process, you know, it was a million dollar mistake. So let's make sure we do it the right way.

Mr. Koenig, let me ask you this, I'm perfectly comfortable if you tell me that you are proposing to simply submit an agreed order. I'm also perfectly happy if you want to -- I can give you some time this afternoon if you want to come back and say, you know, we, you know, we have an agreed order, you can upload it before then, or we have this outstanding issue. You know the conversations that have occurred obviously much better than I do.

What would be the most productive?

MR. KOENIG: I'm happy to take the time if it's not an imposition to you or to chambers. I don't know what your schedule is like. I don't believe we're going to need the time, we had a very productive conversation, I expect we'll be able to get there on the agreed form of order, you know, pretty rapidly. But if Your Honor has time this afternoon, we certainly won't say no to it.

THE COURT: I've had a number of things go off the docket, and so I'm perfectly happy to give you all some time if you think it would be helpful.

MR. KOENIG: Happy to have a place holder on your calendar, and if we end up not needing the time, we can always contact Mr. Alonzo.

THE COURT: Absolutely. How about 3:30 Central,

that would be 4:30 East Coast time. Would that work for everybody?

MS. BERKOVICH: That works for us.

MR. KOENIG: Okay for Celsius.

THE COURT: Okay. Then what we'll do is we will adjourn the hearing until 3:30 with hopes that perhaps an agreed order can be uploaded prior to. But folks who are listening, what I will do is at 3:30 whether we have a hearing or not, I will get on the line and make an announcement so that folks aren't wondering what's occurring.

Any objections to that?

MR. KOENIG: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And again, if you've uploaded an agreed order, no need for you to get on. I know you've got a million other things to do. All I'm going to do is to, if there's been an agreed order, I'm just going to make the announcement that an agreed order's been uploaded, I either have or haven't signed it, and if I have signed it, it's on the docket at Docket Number X. That's all I'll do. Okay?

MR. KOENIG: Okay, Your Honor. And one just quick item to flag, and it's not an issue for today, it's sort of a coming attraction and we wanted to make sure while we had Your Honor in front of us, we discovered that Celsius recently made a pre-payment for January services. That pre-payment's in the amount of about \$4.7 million.

Not for today, not for rejection, it's not going to be part of this resolution. But it's going to be a resolution that we need to work on very soon. We're going to start talking to Core immediately. Hopefully we can reach a resolution. If not, you know, we expect to bring it before Your Honor. But just wanted to flag so that you are aware of it as I said as a coming attraction, potentially either a resolution or for (indiscernible) our right.

THE COURT: I got it. I assume that this is just one in a number of issues that you folks are going to have to address. And as I told you first day and I meant it, I mean it today, as soon as you folks are ready to tee things up, you will have my undivided attention promptly.

MR. KOENIG: Thank you. We appreciate it. We just wanted to make sure Your Honor wasn't surprised.

THE COURT: Nope, I got it. And what's the fun in life if you can't get surprised from time-to-time?

I will see everybody if I need to at 3:30, and if not, you can just reach out to Mr. Alonzo and let him know that an order's there. All right?

MS. BERKOVICH: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. KOENIG: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you everyone. We'll be adjourned until 2:00.

(Recess taken from 12:06 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.)

AFTER RECESS

THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon everyone.

This is Judge Jones, the time is 3:30 Central, today is

January the 3rd, 2023, a continuation of this morning's

docket, the jointly administered cases under Case Number 22
90341, Core Scientific, Inc.

Folks, I would ask that you make an electronic appearance this afternoon, even if you made one this morning. We will keep them separate, and I want the Record to be as accurate as it possibly can be.

Same rules apply, first time that you speak if you would, please state your name and who you represent. That really does give the court reporters a great point of reference.

We are recording using CourtSpeak, we'll have that up on the docket shortly after the conclusion of the hearing.

And with that, folks, where are we, what can I do to help move the process along? And everyone gets a chance, who would like to go first?

MS. BERKOVICH: I'll go first.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Go ahead.

MS. BERKOVICH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Ronit Berkovich with Weil Gotshal for the Debtor.

We come back to you this afternoon with good news, which is that the Debtor and Celsius have reached an agreement

1 in principle on language to be added to the order to address 2 the logistics around decommissioning. 3 THE COURT: Okay. 4 MS. BERKOVICH: I just -- we don't have the exact 5 sort of order with the language in it, we're like 99 percent of the way there. We will submit it, we are confident that 6 7 we're there and we'll submit it to Your Honor this afternoon. We would, however, request a hearing for early tomorrow 8 9 morning just in case, and that's a small percentage chance 10 that we somehow -- the deal falls apart before we're able to 11 submit it. 12 THE COURT: Fair enough. 13 Mr. Koenig, do you agree? 14 MR. KOENIG: Your Honor, Chris Koenig from Kirkland 15 & Ellis for Celsius. 16 We do agree and, sorry to Ms. Berkovich, who's 17 dealing with that. (Indiscernible) better in going first. I 18 agree with all of that. 19 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 20 Then how about, just looking at tomorrow's docket, 21 what about just first thing, 9:00 o'clock Central, would that 22 work for everybody? 23 MS. BERKOVICH: That works for Core, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: Mr. Koenig? 25 MR. KOENIG: That's fine for Celsius.

1 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 2 MR. KOENIG: I don't anticipate (glitch in the 3 audio). THE COURT: No, I got it. I appreciate people 4 5 being -- always have a Plan B in your back pocket. That's the story of my life. 6 7 Then we'll go ahead and set aside 9:00 o'clock 8 Central time in the morning. If you would -- once that order 9 gets uploaded, if you would just make sure you confirm in an 10 email or text with everybody that is playing a role that the 11 hearing will not go forward. 12 What I'll do is I'll check the dial in in the 13 morning. If there are people on and we're not having a 14 hearing, I'll probably just pop on and tell everyone that 15 there's not going to be a hearing. I won't do anything 16 substantive. If no one dials in, then I obviously will --17 I'll just let it be. All right? 18 MS. BERKOVICH: Thank you, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: I appreciate everybody keeping their eye 20 on the end game, and obviously we've got a number of things to 21 work through, and we will get through those just as quickly as 22 you folks are ready to address them. All right? 23 MR. KOENIG: Thank you, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. And I --25 Mr. Koenig, I've got to say, I really like the spinning

1 football helmet in the background. It's mesmerizing. It's 2 right over your shoulder. 3 MR. KOENIG: I appreciate it. Thank you. 4 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Everyone have a 5 good afternoon. We'll be adjourned. MR. KOENIG: Bye-bye. 6 7 (Hearing adjourned 3:33 p.m.) 8 9 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript 10 to the best of my ability due to the condition of the 11 electronic sound recording of the ZOOM/video/telephonic 12 proceedings in the above-entitled matter. 13 /S./ MARY D. HENRY 14 CERTIFIED BY THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF 15 ELECTRONIC REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS, CET**337 16 JUDICIAL TRANSCRIBERS OF TEXAS, LLC 17 JTT TRANSCRIPT #66690 18 DATE FILED: JANUARY 8, 2023 19 20 21 22 23 24 25